



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,016	08/07/2001	Marcel J.G. Janssen	2001B031/2	3019
23455	7590	03/18/2004	EXAMINER	
EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY P O BOX 2149 BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1754	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER _____

ART UNIT _____ PAPER NUMBER _____

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 1-23-04 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

- 1-31 are pending in the application.
1. Claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
Of the above, claims _____
2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. Claims _____ are allowed.
4. Claims 1-31 are rejected.
5. Claims _____ are objected to.
6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 1754

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under Section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

Art Unit 1754

anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 98/15496, for the reasons given in the last Office action. Applicant's argument, that claim 1 recites a diffraction peak in the 17.7 to 18.1 ($2\ \Theta$) range, and that there is no characteristic X-ray diffraction peak in the 17.7 to 18.1 ($2\ \Theta$) range in WO 98/15406 or in the equivalent U.S. Patent 6,334,934, is not convincing, since Table 7 in column 10 of U.S. 6,334,994 shows a reflection peak at $2\ \Theta = 17.73$.

Claims 1-15 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Strohmaier et al., for the reasons given in the last Office action. Applicant's argument, that the Examples which employ conventional heating in Strohmaier et al. effect crystallization at higher temperatures than that used in the inventive Examples, is not convincing. Example 7 of Strohmaier et al., which uses conventional heating, employs a crystallization temperature of 220°C, which is in the preferred crystallization temperature range of 125°C to 225°C as disclosed on page 9, line 24 of applicant's specification. It is further noted that Example 7 of Strohmaier et al. employed di-n-propylamine as a templating agent, and applicant's specification discloses on page 9, line 15 that dipropylamine may be employed as such templating agent. Accordingly the process disclosed in

Serial No. 09/924,016

-4-

Art Unit 1754

Example 7 of Strohmaier et al. is sufficiently identical to that disclosed in applicant's specification so as to shift the burden to applicant to show that the respective products would not be identical. Applicant's argument, that there is no characteristic x-ray diffraction peak in the 17.7 to 18.1 ($2\ \Theta$) range in Strohmaier et al., is not convincing, since the Examples shown in Figure 5 of Strohmaier et al., particularly Example 7, appears to disclose a small diffraction peak at about $2\ \Theta = 18$.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

Serial No. 09/924,016

-5-

Art Unit 1754

communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne A. Langel whose telephone number is (571) 272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WAL:cdc

March 17, 2004

Wayne A. Langel
WAYNE A. LANGEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER